

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 9, 2009. Claims 11 to 16 are pending in the application, of which Claims 11 and 15 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,956,665 (Miyahara). Claims 12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Miyahara in view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0131080 (Enomoto). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns generating one or more print jobs for one or more printers based on a single print order. In one aspect of the invention, when the print order does not indicate color printing, a plurality of print jobs are generated in a unit of a page or a copy for the print order and are respectively assigned to a plurality of print devices having a designated type. However, when the print order indicates color printing, a single print job for the print order is generated and assigned to a single print device having a designated type. Therefore, in a system in accordance with the present invention, it is possible to perform the same tint on color printing since the single print device is used, and to perform high-speed printing on non-color printing since the plurality of print devices are used in parallel.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 11 is directed to a print service system which includes an acquiring unit adapted to acquire a designated type of print devices for printing a content based on a print order; a first judging unit adapted to judge whether or not the print order for the content indicates color printing; a determination unit adapted to determine whether to use a plurality of print devices having the designated type or a single print device having the designated type on printing the content in accordance with a judged

result by said first judging unit, wherein the determination unit determines to use the plurality of print devices when the first judging means judges that the print order does not indicate color printing or to use the single print device when the first judging means judges that the print order indicates color printing; and a print control unit adapted to control the printing of the content so as to generate a plurality of print jobs in a unit of page or copy for the print order, and assign the generated plurality of print jobs to a plurality of print devices having the designated type, respectively, when the determination unit determines to use the plurality of print devices, and so as to generate a single print job for the print order, and assign the generated single print job to a single print device selected from among a plurality of print devices having the designated type, when the determination unit determines to use the single print device.

Claim 15 is directed to a method substantially in accordance with the system of Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied reference, namely Miyahara, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 11 and 15. In particular, Miyahara is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of determining whether to use a plurality of print devices having a designated type, or a single print device having the designated type, on printing content, wherein it is determined to use the plurality of print devices when it is judged that the print order does not indicate color printing and to use the single print device when it is judged that the print order indicates color printing, and controlling the printing of the content so as to generate a plurality of print jobs in a unit of page or copy for the print order, and assign the generated plurality of print jobs to a plurality of print devices having the designated type, respectively, when it is determined in said determining step to use the plurality of print devices, and so as to generate a single print job for the print order, and assign the generated single print

job to a single print device selected from among a plurality of print devices having the designated type, when it is determined in said determining step to use the single print device.

In contrast to the present claims, Miyahara discloses the printing of content containing color pages and monochrome pages mixed together in the content using a color copying machine 105 and a BW digital copying machine 106. In Miyahara, the color pages and monochrome pages are separated for printing on the different pages while the sequence of printing is controlled so that the printed sheets may be recombined. However, Miyahara fails to disclose or suggest assigning a color print job to a single color printer while assigning monochrome pages to a plurality of print devices, in units of a page from a single print order.

In the current Office Action, it is contended that Miyahara discloses the use of a “print order” as that term is used in the present claims. Applicants respectfully disagree with such a characterization of Miyahara. In the present claims, a “print order” is a request for a print job to be printed. However, Miyahara discloses a “page order” at column 8, lines 26 to 63 of Miyahara where it is stated in part that “sheets on which BW images are formed and sheets on which color images are formed are mixed in due page order to constitute a sheaf of sheets.” From the cited portions of Miyahara, it is clear that the “print order” of the present claims is different than the “page order” of Miyahara, which is print sequence of pages of a document onto sheets of paper.

In light of the deficiencies of the cited references as discussed above, Applicants submit that Claims 11 and 15 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS\_WS 3621896v1